

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-17, 19-53, 55, 57-62 and 64-74 are now pending in the application. Claim 75 is cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice to the subject matter contained therein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-4, 6-17, 19-48 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that it unclear how a “register file,” which is a data/software file, can include hardware components. Initially, Applicants respectfully note that the term “file” does not necessarily indicate a software file. For example, as described in Paragraph [003] of the specification, “register file” may refer to a collection of general purpose registers. As such, the term “register file” as recited in the claims refers to structure that can include hardware components.

Notwithstanding the above, Applicants amended the claims to recite “a register system” simply to facilitate prosecution.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103**

Claims 1-4, 8-17, 21-26, 49-53, 55, 57-62 and 64-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jaggar (U.S. Pat. No. 5,701,493). Claims 27-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaggar in view of Kerr et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0159021). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, Jaggar, either singly or in combination with Kerr, fails to show, teach, or suggest that each of the plurality of registers has an address having a length of  $x$  bits, each of the processor modes has a length of  $y$  bits, and the encoded address has a length that is less than  $x + y$  bits.

The Examiner acknowledges that the cited prior art references fail to show, teach, or suggest this limitation. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as well as its dependent claims, should be allowable for at least the above reasons. The remaining independent claims, as well as their corresponding dependent claims, should be allowable for at least similar reasons.

### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**


The Examiner states that claim 75 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants have amended each of the pending independent claims to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 75. As such, claims 1-4, 6-17, 19-53, 55, 57-62 and 64-74 should now be in condition for allowance.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 16, 2007

By:   
Michael D. Wiggins  
Reg. No. 34,754

Damian M. Aquino  
Reg. No. 54,964

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDW/DMA/lah